

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

BETTY’S BEST, INC.,
Plaintiff,

v.

THE INDIVIDUALS, PARTNERSHIPS,
AND UNINCORPORATED
ASSOCIATIONS IDENTIFIED ON
SCHEDULE “A,”
Defendants

Case No. 1:24-cv-07884
Judge: Thomas M. Durkin
Magistrate Judge: Jeffrey T. Gilbert

DEFENDANTS’ FIRST MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO ANSWER

Defendants Nos. 218 (invaluablte.com), 229 (ortasthard.com), 236 (relstidvtion.com), 244 (sutcalibrat.com), 248 (toknforaerd.com), 251 (transmissioni.com), 254 (wedgcatious.com), 221 (lirecteracy.com), 230 (outerimoest.com), 247 (tematically.com), 220 (invisiblen.com), 182 (alongsidem.com), 187 (backgroundi.com), 224 (nicebelie.com), 226 (niowatchted.com), 223 (metallicn.com), 255 (well-infacemall.com), collectively “Defendants” by and through their undersigned counsel, move by and through their attorneys Jacob Chen and DGW Kramer LLP, respectfully submit this first motion for extension of time to Answer.

I. DEFENDANTS REQUEST AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO ANSWER

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) provides that “[w]hen an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time . . . on motion made after the time has expired if the party failed to act because of excusable neglect.”

“The question whether a party's neglect is excusable is at bottom an equitable one, taking account of all relevant circumstances surrounding the party's omission. Relevant circumstances include the danger of prejudice to the non-movant, the length of the delay and its potential impact on judicial proceedings, the reason for the delay, including whether it was within the reasonable control of the movant, and whether the movant acted in good faith.” *Gravitt v Mentor Worldwide LLC*, 342 FRD 130, 133 (N.D. Ill. 2022) (cleaned up).

Defendants have multiple defenses with respect to this action including lack of personal jurisdiction, improper service in violation of the Hague Conventions, and disputes as to and concerning the underlying merits of Plaintiff's case. Defendants have only recently completed a full and complete internal investigation and identified the total sales of allegedly infringing merchandise and are only now in a position to fully respond and answer Plaintiff's Complaint.

This is the first motion for an extension of time filed by the Defendants.

Defendants request an extension of time to answer Plaintiff's complaint and respectfully request twenty-one (21) days. Defendants also believe that this period of time may likely be sufficient for the parties to communicate and reach a potential settlement as to this matter.

Plaintiff was informed as to Defendants' intent to file this application and Defendants' have received Plaintiff's consent for this motion to extend time to file Defendants' answer.

Dated: New York, New York
November 19, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Jacob Chen
Jacob Chen, Esq.
DGW KRAMER LLP
45 Rockefeller Plaza, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10111
Tel: (917) 983-2806
Fax: (917) 633-6183
Email: jchen@dgwllp.com

Attorneys for Defendant Nos.
218, 229, 236, 244, 248, 251, 254, 221,
230, 247, 220, 182, 187, 224, 226, 223, 255